



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/751,616

01/05/2004

Richard A. Chapman

END920030134US1

2422

30449 7590 08/01/2008

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS  
22 CENTURY HILL DRIVE  
SUITE 302  
LATHAM, NY 12110

EXAMINER

ULRICH, NICHOLAS S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2173

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/01/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 47 and 48 are pending.
2. Claims 1-46 are cancelled.
3. Claims 47 and 48 are new.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shelton et al. (US 5954798) and Gavrilescu et al. (US 2002/0198941 A1).

For explanation purposes terminal 104A of Shelton with web browser 114A of Shelton is considered the second browser or consultant browser, where the second user is using terminal 104A of Shelton.

In regard to claim 47, Shelton discloses a method of assisted browser navigation, said method comprising:

a server creating a user context that reflects a context of a session between a user browser and the server (*Column 2 lines 25-30*);

said server creating a consultant context that reflects a context of a session between a consultant browser and the server (*Column 2 lines 25-30*);

second user navigating to the desired information using the consultant browser (*Fig 9 element 902 and Column 12 lines 7-9*);

responsive to the second user navigating to the desired information, said consultant browser transmitting to the server context information identifying an access to the desired information; said server receiving the transmitted context information and storing the received context information in the consultant context (*Column 5 lines 52-67, Column 7 lines 22-28, Column 7 lines 33-35, and Column 7 line 58- Column 8 line 23: a session is created for browser 114A. A session included tracking and recording of activities of the browser where the activities include loading, interacting, and unloading of web pages. This directly relates to context information*);

said server receiving from the consultant browser a request for an identifier pertaining to the context information; said server generating the identifier in response to the received request, said identifier not being a Universal Resource Locator (URL) (*Fig 2, Fig 3, and Column 6 line 62- Column 7 line 33: the request for the identifier from the second (consultant) browser is performed when the browser has been directed to the specific URL for web page 204 in server 52. The second browser is executing in terminal 104A*);

after said generating the identifier, said server generating an association relating to the identifier, said association associating the identifier with the context information by comprising a pointer to the context information (*Column 7 lines 34-35*);

after said generating the association, said server storing the identifier and the association in a repository coupled to the server and providing the identifier to the consultant browser (*Column 6 lines 59-61: database stores information for created sessions*);

after said server providing the identifier to the consultant browser, said consultant browser providing the identifier to the second user (*Column 12 lines 19-23: the web page displays the current session ID*);

after said consultant browser providing the identifier to the second user, said second user providing the identifier to the first user via telephone or email from the second user to the first user; after said second user providing the identifier to the first user, said user browser receiving the identifier from the first user; after said user browser receiving the identifier from the first user, said server receiving the identifier from the user browser, wherein said receiving the identifier from the user browser comprises retrieving the identifier from a data entry field of a web page after the user browser has entered the identifier into the data entry field (*Column 12 lines 28-39*);

after said server receiving the identifier from the user browser, said server identifying the stored identifier in the repository from the received identifier and using the stored association relating to the identifier to identify the context information stored in the consultant context (*Column 14 lines 20-25*);

after said server using the stored association, said server storing the identified context information in the user context, wherein the server is configured to transmit the context information in the user context to the user browser for enabling the user to

access, via the user browser, the desired information (*Column 14 lines 23-42 and Column 13 lines 26-37*).

While Shelton teaches synchronizing browsers, they fail to show the identifying to a second user via telephone or email information that the first user is unable to locate and desires to obtain as recited in the claims. Gavrilesu teaches a method similar to that of Shelton. In addition, Gavrilesu further teaches using web browser synchronization to aid a customer service representative in leading a customer to locations on a web page (*Paragraph 0003: as one skilled in the art knows, customer service representatives are regularly contacted via telephone or email*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Shelton and Gavrilesu before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the synchronization taught by Shelton to include the customer service of Gavrilesu, in order to obtain web synchronization for use by a customer service representative to guide a user to information on a web page. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because implementing web browser synchronization for guiding a user to information is well known in the art, as described by Gavrilesu (*Paragraph 0003*).

In regard to claim 48, Shelton clearly discloses that all the method steps shown in claim 47 are implemented in a server (*Fig 1 element 134*). Therefore the rejections articulated *supra* as to why the combination of Shelton and Gavrilesu teach the claimed subject matter of claim 47 apply to claim 48.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 47 and 48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Shelton et al. (US 5954798) teaches web browser synchronization using unique identifiers to store the contextual information regarding a first browser, in order to instruct a second browser to synchronize with the first browser and display the same contextual information in the second browser as that in the first browser. This is accomplished by first designating the context of a first browser with a unique identifier stored in a data repository for later retrieval. The unique identifier is provided to the second browser in order to access the stored information and bring the second browser to an identical state as the first browser, wherein the first browser can locate information on a web page and direct the second browser to that information.

Gavrilescu et al. (US 2002/0198941 A1) teaches us that cobrowsing or web browser synchronization is useful for customer service representatives to guide a user to information on a web page.

Applicant argues that Shelton fails to anticipate new claims 47 and 48.

1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> example: Applicant states, Shelton does not teach the feature "a first user of the user browser identifying, to a second user of the consultant browser via telephone or email from the first user to the second user, information that the first user

in unable to locate". The examiner agrees and has included the Gavrilesco reference in order to teach these limitations.

3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> examples: Applicant states, Shelton does not teach the feature: "responsive to the second user navigating to the desired information, said consultant browser transmitting to the server context information identifying an access to the desired information". The examiner disagrees. The combination of Gavrilesco and Shelton provide a system where a first user locates information for a second user and then synchronizes the web browsers. Shelton does in fact teach providing contextual information to the server; see Column 5 lines 52-67, Column 7 lines 22-28, Column 7 lines 33-35, and Column 7 line 58- Column 8 line 23. Described in these passages is how the server is responsible for tracking and recording activities of all browsers. The recording includes activities such as loading, interacting, and unloading of web pages. This kind of information is what contextual information consists of, as known in the art.

5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> examples: Applicant states, Shelton does not teach "said server receiving from the consultant browser a request for an identifier pertaining to the context information", "said server generating the identifier in response to the received request, said identifier not being a URL", "said server generating an association relating to the identifier, said associating the identifier with the context information", and "after said generating the association, said server storing the identifier and the association in a repository couple to the server and providing the identifier to the consultant browser". The examiner disagrees. As shown in Fig 2, Fig 3, and Column 6 line 62- Column 7 line 33: the request for the identifier from the second (consultant) browser is performed



when the browser has been directed to the specific URL for web page 204 in server 52. The second browser is executing in terminal 104A. The browser clearly requests an identifier from the server in order to store session information (context) for later synchronization with another browser. The session ID is unique and does not reflect the use of a URL. In Column 7 lines 34-35 Shelton teaches creating a session based on the unique ID given to the browser. Column 6 lines 59-61 Shelton teaches that the database stores information for created sessions and in Column 12 lines 19-23 Shelton teaches that the web page displays the current session ID.

9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> examples: Applicant states, Shelton does not teach “after said server providing the identifier to the consultant browser, said consultant browser providing the identifier to the second user”, “said second user providing the identifier to the first user via telephone or email from the second user to the first user”, “user browser receiving the identifier from the first user, wherein said receiving the identifier from the user browser comprises retrieving the identifier from a data entry field”. The examiner disagrees. Clearly taught, in Column 12 lines 28-39, is that via telephone the current session ID is provided and inputted into a text box.

13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> examples: Applicant states, Shelton does not teach “said server identifying the stored identifier in the repository from the received identifier and using the stored association relating to the identifier to identify the context information stored in the consultant context” and “wherein the server is configured to transmit the context information in the user context to the user browser for enabling the user to access the desired information. The examiner disagrees. As described in Column 12 line 37 -

Column 13 line 19, the identifier is inputted into text box which is used to access the data on the server in order to synchronize the participating web browsers in the identified session using the identifier.

References cited by the examiner through prosecution of the present application, show that web cobrowsing and web browser synchronization is well known in the art. There are numerous methods taught throughout the cited references for conducting web browser synchronization. It is clear to the examiner that these techniques can be used for helping a customer service representative guide a user through a web page, as taught by Gavrilesu. Shelton clearly teaches a method of web browser synchronization using unique identifiers to store contextual information. Therefore, claims 47 and 48 are anticipated by the cited references and stand rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2173

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS S. ULRICH whose telephone number is (571)270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571)272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Nicholas Ulrich  
7/31/2008

Application/Control Number: 10/751,616  
Art Unit: 2173

Page 11

2173